

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/494,799	01/31/2000	Rene Roberts	2002576-0001	3973
7:	590 07/29/2003			
Elizabeth E. Nugent Choate, Hall & Stewart, Exchange Place 53 State Street			EXAMINER	
			WEISBERGER, RICHARD C	
Boston, MA 0	2109-2891		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	
			DATE MAILED: 07/29/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

^)			SK			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
7		09/494,799	ROBERTS, RENE			
0	ffice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Richard C Weisberger	3624			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
Period for Rep	ייץ :NED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL`	VIC CET TO EVOIDE 2 MONTU/	e) EDOM			
THE MAILI - Extensions or after SIX (6) if the period for the second for the sec	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. If time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period by within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eived by the Office later than three months after the mailing therm adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)☐ Res	ponsive to communication(s) filed on	<u> </u>				
2a)⊠ This	action is FINAL . 2b) Th	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim	n(s) <u>124</u> is/are pending in the applicatio	n.				
•	f the above claim(s) is/are withdra					
	n(s) is/are allowed.					
<u> </u>	n(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.					
<u> </u>	n(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim	n(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Application Pa	apers					
9)∐ The s	pecification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)∏ The di	rawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep	oted or b) objected to by the Exar	miner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
•	ath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
	35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
•	owledgment is made of a claim for foreigr	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
·	b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
_	Certified copies of the priority document					
2.	Certified copies of the priority document					
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
	he translation of the foreign language prowledgment is made of a claim for domest					
Attachment(s)						
2) 🔲 Notice of Dra	ferences Cited (PTO-892) aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _	5) Notice of Informal F	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/494,799 Page 2

Art Unit: 3624

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. 1) storing securities market data in real time, 2) updating market data in real time, 3) storing bond data in real time, 4) forwarding the market data to others in real time, 5) issues names in real time, 6) coupons or maturities data in real time, 6) collecting data obtained from a query in real time, and 7) updating said query in real time.

2. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - a. The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claim 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The limitation "in real time" is ambiguous.

The limitation "other types of securities market data" is vague and indefinite.

Application/Control Number: 09/494,799

Art Unit: 3624

5. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Bloomberg Fact sheet.
- 7. The prior art teaches that an interactive financial information (a genus for all the species claimed) network. A representative fact sheet of the Bloomberg system is attached. The examiner takes official notice that this system comprises a storage means, controller means, and data terminal means. The claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure, but the reference fails to expressly teach of capturing and disseminating the data in "real time". Nevertheless, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). "When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not." In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In the alternative, it would have been obvious for one of skilled in the art at the time to have captured and disseminating the information in real time as motivated by the need to reduce trading risk.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/494,799

Art Unit: 3624

Respectfully Submitted

Rich Weisberger

Business Methods Examiner Patents of Banking and Finance

703 308 4408

Richard.Weisberger@uspto.gov